

# **On the recent attacks against our sub and our moderators on regards of idpol by the agents of Revisionism and division**

Comrades, both users, moderators, everyone. There are ongoing attacks against us, for more than a month, from many subs that have a numerical advantage over us. Everyone knows the reason, so the central committee and the mod team assigned me to write a response to this act of "war" and "defamation", by writing a short essay on the topic at hand.

## **Who are the ones insigating this?**

The ones instigating this are westerners, liberals and those who think they understand Marxism while they have manifested that they do not. Proof for this is their cooperation with r/socialism and r/anarchism, two of the most anti communist subreddits out there, who vocally supported the imperialist attacks against the PRC, and not only this, but vocally and proudly defame real communists and real socialist states, for whom our grandparents have shed blood for, in Europe, Asia, Americas, Africa and all around the globe.

But let's take things from the start. All this started after some mods on r/moretankiechapo decided to ban me (without even posting there) because I posted a thread on r/fullcommunism in which I considered the CPGB-ML one of the best parties in Europe. There have been some other smaller conflicts with the MTC in the past, thus it may also have a link to these problems.

Fast forward we decided to hold a vote on our own sub about the issue. Based on the previous voting (before this one), it was decided that we would have a new private sub, r/Electionsforsocialist, now that we have three sister subs, to hold elections. We held the 5th elections, and there were 4 proposals. One of them was from u/ravenwolf97, and it was about my removal from the position of the head mod.

This proposal was met with defeat, only 5 out of the 30 voters approved of this, including Ravenwolf himself, while the first proposal, which was the "infamous" motion

on rejecting idpol, got 25 votes out of 30 people who voted. This means, that the motion had an 80% approval by the mod team, even though our mod team is very diverse in their leftist views(anarchists, libsocs, maoists included).

Now, in the thread about the voting, u/Zaratustash , a westerner, defamed our sub as well as our mod team on every place in existence. He never used any real Marxist argument, instead he verbally attacked us, called us un-marxist and transphobes.

Furthermore, he even made a post on r/chapotrathouse calling for a brigade in our sub, in response to a post made by a user that was about the anti idpol book of CPGB-ML (which did not break any of the subs rules).

But the worst is this. After a while, we received open attacks by other subs against us, such as the one made by u/jeg623. He is from what I saw something like an anarchist, he posted an article "The current stance taken by r/EuropeanSocialists regarding the rights of the LGBTQ+ community is problematic" to the liberal anti communist sub, r/socialism.

On the same day, we saw a post called "Weekly Report from Meta Sub" in which the mods of r/Anarchism openly acknowledge that they were discussing with the other socialist mods to ban us all. These kinds of attitude proves the divisive nature of idpol, but we will talk about it in more depth below.

Now, for the sake of an argument, I will answer his "points" one by one

"The purpose of this subreddit is to create a community for far-left Europeans to share their experiences in the struggle against capitalism especially in Europe. Their Constitution is radical and supports the Soviet-style of socialism and the subreddit, in accordance with Democratic Centralism, must follow it."

Point is, that only the mods are required to follow the "constitution" (we always called it "the line"), keep in mind that these very lines, were voted for. Nothing in the lines or even the rules were without vote. One can verify this by seeing our votes and elections. Everything was decided by vote, and for something to pass, there always needs to be an approval rate of more than 50% in accordance to democratic centralism. This is why every mod, shall follow the line. While normal users have no attachment to this, as the very rules allow for debate (rule 1). We have a rule which enables anyone to ask a question as well.

"In fact, it is the explicit position of the moderator team that any discussion against these stances (or as quoted in their Constitution, "bad faith questions and discussions) will, based on the language, result in a ban."

First of all, we try to keep quality in the sub. Any insult or trolling will be met with warning, and if the accused continues, he will be met with a ban. I do not think that we are too extreme to that, as in all the other subs you do not even see a warning, just a ban and end of story.

It is obvious that if you come to degrade the quality of the sub, then yes, expect a warning and if you continue, a ban. The user should have said that we have perhaps the best ban policy on the whole leftosphere of reddit.

"Their stances will of course spark controversy among the left, especially their stance regarding the European Union"

The fact that there is even such a question among the people hanging around r/socialism, proves how much the word "left" has degraded. EU is something that we need to oppose 100%. In europe, the fight against capitalism starts with the fight against imperialism, and its arm in europe, the EU/NATO terrorist organizations.

"the subreddit has voted to adopt a resolution in "The Fifth Vote" for the complete probation of the posting or discussion of material relating to Identity Politics"

No. This is a complete lie. We allow posts on the topic of idpol. However, after the vote, we saw only posts about idpol, this is why the cc decided to limit discussions about idpol until 1/1/2020. It is obvious that anyone can create a post about idpol. It is not banned. Users are not moderators, therefore they are free of the "democratic centralism", as long as they respect our rules. Unlike other subs, we view our sub as a platform of serious communication and discourse, and not as a "pass your time memeing" platform. We consider ourselves serious, therefore we want serious discussions.

Now, having made mistakes in the very first paragraphs, the user tries to "refute" our points on the resolution. Lets see what this great scientist has to tell.

## The definition given by u/jeg623

One may ask, "what was his definition"?

"A systematic, revolutionary approach to the concerns of certain groups (ethnic, religious, cultural and racial minorities, working people, LGBTQ+ people, the elderly, the young, and others) within **proletarian society, whose concerns may not be directly related to the oppression of the proletariat under capitalism**, but still cause them oppression and general despair due to capitalism's related effects (e.g.

racism, transphobia, homophobia, bigotry, islamophobia, elder abuse, and poverty, etc.)"

Now, let's examine the content that we highlighted. What this great theorist has to say?

First we don't live in a proletariat society. We live in a capitalist society. This is important, because it gives the false notion that anyhow the proletariat has any impact on the way the society functions (therefore the false idea of "liberal democracy").

Our comrade does not even understand this.

Then to the second. Well, this is what everything boils down to. What is oppression and who does it affect? It seems that a gay or a black billionaire is effected of racism, therefore we need to fight for their rights!

Well, everyone understands that we Marxists have acknowledged that class struggle is where everything boils down, and this is provable. The sole reason the blacks in USA are oppressed is because they are largely a proletariat. In USA they had a black president. Are the black bourgeoisie oppressed? No. The only ones really oppressed are the proletariat, and the blacks, due to a long history of slavery, are largely in this class in contrast to whites who may be petty bourgeoisie, or in the upper echelons of the proletariat, i.e. labour aristocracy.

Now let's see how he gives his support to this definition

"I find this a valid term for four reasons. The first reason is that by uniting all diverse peoples under one common struggle, those being the capitalist institutions that cause their oppression,"

Ok. Fine. This common struggle is class struggle, no one even denies that.

But what does he do? Let's see the next words.

"we make it clear that, even if you do not identify with the proletariat specifically, your struggle against capitalism is their struggle."

Well, first let's see the first problem. First, being proletariat is not an identity. It is not on your will to decide. This is what idealism and liberalism try to paint, that you can be anything you want. No. If you are not selling your wage labour, you are not a proletariat, regardless on what do you think of yourself.

But the most important thing is below.

"your struggle against capitalism is their struggle."

Ok comrades, lets give our hellos to comrades barack Obama and steve job the martyred. This is why we are against idpol. No, gay struggle and black struggle is not a struggle against capitalism becuase capitalists hate gays and blacks becuase they are what they are, but becuase these people fall in the categories of the working class by the ways that capitalism functions. Which is to say, that there can be no liberation of a black worker under capitalism.

The above is an appeal to class colloboration. Our common struggle is class struggle. Nothing more, nothing less. If a black or gay person is a worker, then end of strory, we have a common struggle. If they are bourgeoisie, then they are the enemy.

There is no reason to address their specific problem in capitalism, because this would be detaching the individual out of the whole, and it would give the false narrative that racism, an idea, is what oppresses the particular group, while the reality is that racism exists to justify the function of capitalism, therefore capitalism must be replaced, and as a result, racism will disappear and fade away. Not all people on these groups are anti capitalists, simply because their interests lie with maintaining it.

**We Marxists believe that only the emancipation of the masses can emancipate the individual, not the other way around.**

Therefore, by the means of class war, we automatically include any worker, regardless of color or sexuality. There is no more reason to subdivide this by hugging the group, because the group also has bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie in it.

## **The rebuttal Saint Jeg made and our responce**

Let's continue now with the supposed rebuttal of our motion

"By the provided definition, identity politics is not divisive. Rather, the oppression that Identity Politics explores and finds is essentially a proletarian struggle. Indeed, by the intersectional and far-reaching nature of Identity Politics, there are internal conflicts within the proletariat that when finding a solution may conflict with the needs of other groups. However, those can be dismissed as bourgeois lies and fantasies. Take, as an example, the calls for reparations to African-Americans for their long history of slavery and present oppression in America. Many would take this as monetary compensation, but that is capitalist thinking. Not every reparation has to be monetary. Money can never, ever, simply make

centuries of oppression disappear. The real goal of the reparations is a reversal of that oppression. We reverse that oppression by uplifting our fellow human beings, by helping them uplift themselves and joining them on the long path of reconciliation and racial unity. That path will be fraught with many bumps, but we must take it. The point is, we do not face a situation of "choosing a different path" than that of socialism: we face paths to socialism that must all be taken, and one of those paths is Identity Politics."

Here, he tries to paint idpol as not divisive. It does seem to look good, but the problem with his argument lies deeper. But here we need to dig a little on theory. Why do the ideas of racism or homophobia exist and why it is impossible to make all workers denounce these ideas under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and why it never worked.

We need to address this; What class holds political power? The bourgeoisie. And as long as the bourgeoisie are consisted of persons, they also produce ideas, culture e.t.c

"The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance. The individuals composing the ruling class possess among other things consciousness, and therefore think. Insofar, therefore, as they rule as a class and determine the extent and compass of an epoch, it is self-evident that they do this in its whole range, hence among other things rule also as thinkers, as producers of ideas, and regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age: thus their ideas are the ruling ideas of the epoch. For instance, in an age and in a country where royal power, aristocracy, and bourgeoisie are contending for mastery and where, therefore, mastery is shared, the doctrine of the separation of powers proves to be the dominant idea and is expressed as an "eternal law"."

#### **- German ideology Marx/Engels**

What is racism, and all the phobias, if not ideas? Therefore, as long as the producer of these ideas rule, they will produce such ideas. There is no other way around. The proletariat in its majority will be by definition socially backwards because of this very fact. Therefore, there needs to be an appeal to interests. What is their interest? This is how the movements of the proletariat functioned.

And as this was cleared, let's follow up on why idpol is divisive. If someone wants to remain true to his beliefs, of idpol, then he will need to disavow any who has backwards ideas against a single minority. As we presented, the mass is by definition socially backwards (obviously there are breaks with this at some level, but the bourgeoisie will

create new "phobias" to divide the working class), i.e the mass. If you disavow the mass, you stay with vastly petty bourgeois intelligentsia, and some workers who have class consciousness, and were also able to break with these backwards ideas. But as long as you keep disavowing the working class because of their naturally backwards beliefs, instead of uniting with them on the basis of interests (class struggle), what do you do? You divide the movement. One needs to look no further than here. We are not even transphobes, and they banned us from everywhere for this supposed thing, just because we are anti-idpol. Now, imagine what they would do to the real proletariat.

I was not as lucky, so I was born in a proletariat family, and I know first hand that 99% of the proletariat in my country are transphobes. What do you do? You either need to disavow them to remain true to idpol, or you unite with them and form a movement with one main goal, the dictatorship of the proletariat (ie class struggle), with everything else taking a secondary positions, being addressed without expulsions, as they can only be addressed in full when the proletariat takes power and starts producing ideas.

Therefore, if you chose the first option (idpol), what do you do? You divide the movement.

The question is not about black or gay power. It is about proletariat power. The movement should be open for the workers, without race or sexuality mattering at all, as long as you are a worker. Therefore, by focusing on class struggle you unite the movement. You unite those that should be united, the workers, independent of race, sexuality, e.t.c

If we put the secondary, the ideas produced by the bourgeoisie, on par with class struggle and the goal of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, then we will need to abandon the ones who are influenced by these ideas and culture, the workers, who encompass the majority of the population.

Let's continue to the second point.

"The only thing reactionary, that is fake, is liberal Identity Politics. No one pays attention to the concept of Identity Politics under the Red Banner, which is essentially what the provided definition is: it is an understanding that the struggles of separate identities, of separate peoples, are all a commonly proletarian struggle against oppression caused by capitalist institutions. You do not have to be a textbook proletarian to be a member of the proletariat. If the textbook definition of a proletariat is someone who works in a factory, then we are ignoring centuries of Left discourse on what counts as work. Importantly left out of this definition are other professions that are now understood (even back then) as work, such as agricultural work, musical composition, or even sex work. This definition also considers those that do

not work but are still oppressed, such as the elderly of the young, who respectively have their plights ignored because they cannot (or cannot as of yet) provide their labor, and are (the youth specifically) indoctrinated with propaganda that can potentially push them into a dangerous, disparaging mentality. The point is, just because liberals like it (or their farcical version of it), does not mean that we cannot. Liberal Identity Politics are reactionary fake news. Identity Politics under the red banner is not."

Here, our dear saint Jeg, makes the fundamental mistakes which is the reason why we oppose idpol, and why not a single idpoler has ever produced a Marxist critique against anti idpol (quite the contrary), because such a critique is incompatible with Marxism, and such a critique would need to go back to liberal definitions to produce a critique, or heavenly revise Marxism (french theory).

Lets examine this bit by bit.

"it is an understanding that the struggles of separate identities, of separate peoples, are all a commonly proletarian struggle against oppression caused by capitalist institutions."

No, they are not. Not all people are proletariat, and this is the reason that Idpol can be so easelly co opted by liberals. Because it by no means touches class struggle, most of the time when we speak of idpol. Saint Jeg here, ignores, or perhaps forgets who are the proletariat and how they are defined. A black/white/asian/gay/trans/ e.t.c person, will not care about the issue of class struggle, if it is not his interest. It is unrelative if he is gay or not, since he may not be a worker. Picture this. A Trans person, who is a bourgeoisie or petty bourgeoisie, may very well fight for his "rights" (in capitalism, rights means the right of the bourgeoisie to exploit labour) as a trans person, but his fight stops there. If we are to fight for class struggle with end result of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he will be met with a dilemma;

Why should he? Why should he endanger his position as a bourgeoisie? it is not his interest.

Now take also the backwards character of the proletariat, and he may even start to despise the popular masses.

This is the reality, our saint here shot his foot, saying the thing that can be proven wrong in seconds. Even if we take it by larger groups of Idpol, such as national ones, we can see that again class plays the first role. In every independence struggle, there were bourgeoisie who co opted the independence struggle, with capitalism, because it can be very well function. Lets remember that South Korea still exists, let's remember who fought the viet cong; there were not only Americans, there were also vietnamese.



Hence, it is again proven that idpol has as its natural conclusion, the abandonment of class struggle, as there are again two options. Either remaining true to idpol, and put it first, or even on par with class struggle, therefore dividing the movement which will lead to its utter collapse.

Either, we give this issues a secondary seat and focus on class struggle and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, first and foremost. Working towards this goal, allying with the workers, independent of their ideas, which are bound to exist and be largely backwards and reactionary, will result in us the workers being victorious over the bourgeoisie.

"You do not have to be a textbook proletarian to be a member of the proletariat. If the textbook definition of a proletariat is someone who works in a factory, then we are ignoring centuries of Left discourse on what counts as work"

This is the best. It fully proves that utter ignorance of supporters of idpolers.

Here, he tries to present class as an identity. This is completely false. Workers are not workers because they want to, but because they have no means of production. There is no such thing as work being discussed here. Everyone counts as a worker if we use wrong definitions, because in that way, the bourgeoisie work also in their office.

In short, saint Jeg who wrote this, and it got officially approved by the only "Marxist - Leninist" moderator of r/socialism Bayarea, does not even know what class is. This speaks a lot about the ones who banned and excommunicated us.

"Importantly left out of this definition are other professions that are now understood (even back then) as work, such as agricultural work, musical composition, or even sex work."

I will ignore "sex work" for another day, and i will insntead focus on the core of this. So, in his opinion, the proletariat is defined by his work! Well, oh my, it nonsensical to me

that a person who describes himself as a Marxist does not even know how the proletariat is defined. Let's give him a helping hand.

The proletariat is the class of people who own zero means of production. What they own is only their labour power, and they sell this commodity to survive.

Simple as that. The nice thing is this, that he points for example at agricultural work as working class. Well, peasants are not a revolutionary class by itself (this is why they should be led by the workers) because they own land, they own the means of production. They are petty bourgeoisie, they are by no means proletariat. Proletariat is

no someone who works manually, proletariat and bourgeoisie are defined by relationships to the means of production. Those who own, and those who do not.

"Liberal Identity Politics are reactionary fake news. Identity Politics under the red banner is not."

Saint Jég proved that indeed, there is no marxist "idpol".

Lets continue with his third point.

"The advent of Identity Politics came from the discussion of the oppression of different people under capitalism, who found that their experience was unique. Take for example the concerns of women. Throughout much of history, women have been regarded simply as tools of maintenance, labor, and reproduction in the service of capitalist greed. The work of a housekeeper is work, the work of a female worker is work, the work of a mother is work. The woman is thus a member of the proletariat, as she is capable of labor and is being exploited for it. Yet, her exploitation is unique, and can only really be understood by her fellow women. How else could we come to this than by inquiring about the unique nature of her exploitation? That is Identity Politics at its most bare: an understanding that one's exploitation under capitalism is, due to your identity, most likely unique, and is still a struggle against capitalism even if the nature of one's struggle is not necessarily proletarian. Yet, if the being of a person is under attack by capitalism, they must offer their labor to survive in the capitalist system, which means their struggle, even if it was not proletarian, is now a proletarian struggle. Yet the struggle of a unique identity if it does not engage in labor is still a proletarian struggle, as those not actively giving their labor (like the unemployed) are still considered a part of the proletariat, but that is the essence of the contradiction: r/EuropeanSocialists says in this resolution that they support the struggles of the sexually diverse peoples, but refuse to acknowledge the epistemic process by which their struggles were recognized."

Well, here he touches the issue of women. Right bellow, it is proven why identity politics subdivide the proletariat.

"Take for example the concerns of women. Throughout much of history, women have been regarded simply as tools of maintenance, labor, and reproduction in the service of capitalist greed. "

Here, he ignores entirely historical materialism. Two things are understood by this. First, that Saint Jég does not know that women were not always bellow men, as in primitive times, and even in some cases today, you have matriarchal societies and second, that he seems to not understand that history was not always capitalism.

Women have their roles in the system, as the family, for material reasons, and their "continues liberation" during the period of 19th - 21st century is not based on the advancement of ideas regarding feminism, but on the need of the system to incorporate women into work because of the advance on the mode of production.

"The woman is thus a member of the proletariat, as she is capable of labor and is being exploited for it. "

Yet, her exploitation is unique, and can only really be understood by her fellow women. "

From this part again, two things should be understood. First, that Saint Jeg ignores that not all women are proletariat, and it is unrelated, as woman does not equal proletariat. Indeed, most women fall in the class of the proletariat due to the working of the system, which needs the proletariat class to rise and rise, until it becomes the majority.

Not all women are proletariat, and the liberal "feminist struggle" is their struggle to become bigger and more independent bourgeoisie than their male counterparts. By simply working towards class struggle, you encompass the proletariat women by necessity. Women hold up half of the sky, it is impossible to have a proletariat movement or a dictatorship of the proletariat (economically) without the liberation of women.

Now the second part, is the following "can only really be understood by her fellow women". All know the answer on how this thinking serves to divide the working class, as manifested above.

I will ignore addressing the bellow of his third point, as it is already proven that he does not understand what class means.

Someone who understands it, will see why his point is unfunded.

## **Fourth and last point**

"Let us imagine for a moment a successful proletarian struggle without the guise of Identity Politics. There are members of the proletariat who have unique identities, such as having a different sexual orientation. In this proletarian society, they have been historically oppressed by social stigma against homosexuality. Are these sexually different comrades, by virtue of their being proletarian, finally liberated to a proletarian society that does not address its historical homophobia? No, it does not. By the logic of the resolution adopted by r/EuropeanSocialists, homophobia is not tolerated, and of course it should not be. Yet in a proletarian society that does not struggle against its past homophobia, this section of the proletariat is only half-liberated, and so capital still holds us in its tight grip. We require an understanding of Identity Politics because of this, so that our proletarian comrades can combat homophobia and live in a proletarian society where they are liberated from their struggle and can live free of oppression. Half-liberation is oppression of a different kind. We only do a disservice to socialism by ignoring Identity Politics."

Here, the problem in his thinking is that we Marxists, consider exploitation and oppression as material ones, not as idealist ones. The working class is not oppressed by

ideas, it is oppressed because it is robbed of its fruits of labour.

He poses a good question: How will we fight the ideas of homophobia, transphobia racism e.t.c?

Well, as we already established, that the producers of these ideas are the bourgeoisie, we need to not look any more on this. But for the sake of the argument, let's answer his question directly.

Oppression is material. Once we eliminate wage labour, automatically, these people stop being exploited. As the mode of production changes, social relations change, and the superstructure also changes. Not all trans/black/white etc people are oppressed. The bourgeoisie ones of these groups are actually oppression. But when we speak about class struggle, by definition the majority of the trans/black/white e.t.c people are included in this struggle as they are working class. The reality is that under capitalism their issues cannot be solved, because the fundamental reality is that the exploitation is not based around identity, but around class.

The fundamental contradiction which is also the lever of economic, and therefore social change is class war and classes in domination. Therefore, only by changing the base, which can only be changed by interests (working class having different interests than the status quo) can we change the superstructure, which is where transphobia lies.

Only then, we will be able to produce culture and ideas, and fight the reactionary ideas of racism, homophobia and transphobia e.t.c in its whole.

We do not want to serve a specific group, because this would have as a logical conclusion that all men are brothers, which is utopian and therefore anti Marxist. No, not all men are brothers, and not all trans, lesbians, and gays are my brothers/sisters, just because they are trans, gays, e.t.c

The bourgeoisie are no brothers of the proletariat, regardless of their identity.

To end this deal with Saint Jerg, he claims to be a marxist leninist. No need to prove again that he is not.

## **On Bayarea, and the conclusion**

"Comrade" u/bayarea415, the only supposed marxist leninist mod of r/socialism, made the following comment of the polemic thread of Saint Jerg.

"As a Leninist, thank you for making this post. It's absolutely appalling that they would downplay minority struggles like this, especially with LGBTQ+ comrades. We should all stand directly in opposition to these sorts of platforms. The mods and r/socialism have made it very clear on where we stand here. "

To add some background information, we invited bayarea to join r/americiassocialists, but he denied. Then he posted this, making clear that he is our enemy.

Now, are identity politics divisive? Let's see the evidence. We banned zero people, they conspired to ban all of us, and they did. We are not even transbobs, they just banned us because we are Marxists and students of Marx. Even if we were to be wrong, they do not ban people who are outright anti communists, but they ban us instead. This is proof of the divisive nature of idpol that we spoke earlier. For example, let's look at comrade Bayarea. He stays a mod of r/socialism, a sub that hosts anti communist posts every second day, even after he was removed and put last, with the lowest of power he denies to ally with us, just because we upheld democratic centralism and because we are Marxists. A supposed Marxist Leninist refuses to enter a Marxist leninist sub and instead chooses to remain an ally of anti communists, just because these anti communists are "not transphobes", (not that we are, but it proves a point of the logic behind it) or because they conform to the norms of the western left about idpol.

Other than that, the "pro-idpolers" seem to be unable to produce a proper critique. Instead they rely on bullying, bans, insults, death threats, e.t.c.

As evidence, one can simply go and see the thread on the book of CPGB-ML on r/europeansocialists. They come there and insult, brigade, and wish our deaths. Such is the political and theoretical understanding of our adversaries, and they respond to us who know and stay true to Marxism, by excommunicating us because they are afraid of the project we are building.

In conclusion, yes, idpol is divisive, anti marxist, and therefore reactionary, proven by theory, its logical conclusion, and of course practice.

To our mods: Comrades, stay strong. We practice democratic centralism. Know that if any of you disagree with the notion of upholding the line which was voted, you are free to resign. Obviously they will be free to post and participate in our sub, we do not ban people on their opinions, we encourage debate.

**Written by Francesko U. Kuqe, or the albanian bolshevik.**

**Special thanks to all comrades from the cc, and the users and normal mods.**

Special thanks to comrades Jmlsky for providing sources on french thoery and to Odarin for small changes.